F. 21/93

G. R. S. [illegible]

Previous references. 1894 - 98

192

File No 138

Later references. ( )

Serial Nos

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos.

21/93 Part B for [illegible]

SUBJECT.

Claim of Venkatagowda to the patelship of Bellahalli, Gubbi Taluk.

Commissioner

1

Case is 23. 1 Pl for hearing.
Parties & Appeals & both parties.
OR 7/11

P. Exhibits

Appeal Suit No 172
of 1892-93.

Appellant:—
Venkata Gowda son of Govinda Naika, Patelan of Gubbi Taluk.

Respondent:—
Giri Gowda, son of Nanjasimha Gowda, of the same village.

The Appellant held the office of Patel of Bellahalli from about 1875-76. In 1888, the Respondent, then a minor, presented a petition to the Amildar of Gubbi, stating that the Patel of Bellahalli was hereditary in his family and was held by his father

Narasimha Gonda for some time, that as he was unable, on account of old age, to perform the duties of the office the Amildar appointed Venkati Gonda (Appji) to do duties till Narasimha Gonda's son became competent; he prayed that as he was able to hold the office, the registry might be transferred to his name, and that he might be allowed to do the Patti work.

The Amildar issued the following endorsement:— * Ro 5-19, 4 28th March 85.

"In personal enquiry you have stated that the registry has been transferred away to the name of Venkate Gowda. Besides, you are very young and unfit for public duty. Therefore nothing can be done now" ab- [illegible] *

On 9th December 1892, the Respondent again presented a petition to the Amildar

that Mirasdar Venkatagowda was competent and literate. It is according to this that Venkatagowda has been doing the work since that time.

"The present Petitioner who is the Registered son is a competent man, and is literate to the extent necessary.

× × × ×

Since the Registered Mirasdar was imbecile and his sons were incompetent, Venkatagowda was only mentioned in the Register to be competent to do the work, but has received no order.....

I submit that orders may be passed to transfer the Register to the name of Giri Gowda and to get the work done by him."

The Amildar's recommendation was sanctioned by the Deputy Commissioner on the 2nd January, 1915.

Samad was granted bail
on the 1st February 93 and
he took charge of the office from
the Appellant on the 20th
March.

On the 27th March the
Appellant presented a
review application to the
Deputy Commissioner which
it is the effect that on the
Amildar's report that
Narayanda Gouda was the
Registered and that as
his sons were minors, Venkat
Gouda was doing the work,
it was ordered that Giri
Gouda must be appointed
to his father's office, that
if Venkat Gouda had come
to the office on his own hat, he
might have produced, at
the time of enquiry, the necessary
regarding his hat; and that
if he was a hatdar, he must
obtain redress the by a regular
suit.

The present appeal to
Government is against the

× Ap 244 of 3/4/93.

1 Hanumanta, and Sitamala Gonda

Persons looking after the Gonshire work —

1 Timmappa, Grandson of the Rajendra Gonda-giri Gonda

1 Sitamala Gonda son of Gajakati Gonda

1 Ais man Narasimha Gonda

1 Giri Gonda.

4.

× × ×

Marginal Shares.

In the enquiry made now it is ascertained that

Old Rajendra Gadde-giri Gonda is dead; his sons Venkataramana Gonda and Govinda Raida are living; and

(Old Rajendra) Gajakati Gonda is dead; his son Narasimha Gonda is living.

According to the Mockadda-tar agreement the Gadde-giri Rajendra were 9 shares during the time, and now all they Rajee Gajakati Gonda

Narasimha Gonda looking after the work. Gadadhi Narasimha Gonda mixed look after the work. After him Venkataramana Gonda's son Timma Gonda comes last after the work."

F. Statement of Patels' Miras. for 1875-76.—

Narasimha Gonda is mentioned in the Column of Patil. In the column of the Assistant Commissioner's Recommendation the following is entered:—

"The Registerdar is incompetent and old. His sons are not competent. Nissedar Venkata Gonda is competent and knows how to write."

S.V.

(General Serial No. 32.)

13 189 .

(2)

No. 2701

Name of Petitioner. Venkatesa Gowda

Village. Bettahalli

Taluk. Gubbi

District. Tumkur

Date of Arzi. 19-4-93.

Date of Receipt. 20-4-93.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. eight.

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the Tumkur District Deputy Commissioners order in 765 dated 20-1-93 in re the Patelship of the above village.

21-4-93.

Appeal dismissed in toto. Order passed against parties.

Proceedings to be called for with appeal.

Myaore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

(General Serial No. 30.)

15

420

13 JUL 9

1893. 9 pt 21

From The Deputy Commissioner

Tumkur district.

4

L. R. 158-92-3

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt. of Mysore.

Dated, 12th July. 1893.

Despatched 12th

Received

Enclosures No. 4 Nos.

General No.

No. 34.

Chief Secretary's Memo: dt: 12th July 1893.

Reports on the Petition of Sri Kalegowda of Kalla-hadi Village in the Gubbi Taluk regarding the Patel of the said Village.

Returns the record of the case & returns the Enclosures.

Peter Bor

Comm

13/7

Box
Petitions 1894

57
8

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. N. 2701A
DATE 20-4-93

18

(1)

COURT FEE
RE
TWO RUPEES

Two Rupees Stamp

Before the Commissioner of
Civil Appeals Bellary Circle
of Allegation

A.S. No 142
92. 93.

Revenue Miscellaneous Appeal
Case No of 1893.

Appellant.
Venkatappa Gowda, Son of
Gowdra Rajaka and others,
Patel of the village of Bellahalli
attached to Chikkaballi
Sanneate of the Gubbi
Taluq, Tumkur District

Respondent.
Giriyappa Gowda, Son of
Narasimha Gowda
and Puttaiah Patel of the
said village of Bellahalli

The Appellant's Statement

we have respectfully beg to prefer
their appeal against the order No 759,
dated 20-1-1893 and also against the
endorsement No 244/3 dated 3-4-1893,
of the Deputy Commissioner of the
Lucknow district.

A certified copy of the order No 759
dated 20-1-1893 is herewith submitted
and marked A. The said order is to the
following effect viz.

"It may be done"

The endorsement No 244/3 dated
3-4-1893 is written on the back
of the petition dated 27-3-1893,
addressed by the Appellants to the
Deputy Commissioner. The said
petition together with the above
endorsement is herewith produced
and marked B.

The said endorsement is to the
following effect viz;

"upon the report of the Building
to the effect that no objection be raised
in the petition respectfully

The grounds of appeal are the following - viz: 21

I. That the Respondent misdirected in saying that the office of Patel of the village in question belonged to the Respondent's father and that that office ceased on his death to the Respondent.

II. That the Appellant is a relation to the office of Patel of the village of Bellahalli and the Respondent has got no title and right in title to the land than the Appellant.

III. That the Respondent, in his address before the Amildar has not at all stated the Appellant's relation to the office in question, but merely stated that the Appellant is a ryot as of the Appellant is an utter stranger to the office.

IV. That the Respondent's pleader in addressing to the Amildar of Chikkaballi

of Chikkaballi Canal and the Appellant's Khatedar was taken of Chikkaballi Canal and no notice was given to the Appellant of the enquiry fixing a certain date.

V. That the order of the Respondent Commissioner is wholly based on the Report of the Amildar and the Amildar did not give an opportunity to the Appellant to obtain and produce the necessary Copies connected with the case and no proceeding has been made in this Case.

VI. That the Register of 1873 and 1874 and the Khajeed Patte of 1874 and the Jodaile Mirasi Register of 4 years (1872-76) herewith produced and marked respectively B, D, E and F, clearly show that the Appellant is a Khatedar of the Agricultural Land.

VII. That the Respondent Commissioner did not give any notice to the Appellant before the Passed his order No 7-9 dated 20-1-1893 on the Report of the Amildar and the Appellant Canal to Keep of this order on the

of the office in question adversely to the Respondent's father and also the Respondent since 1875-76, that is for upwards of 12 years and the claim of the Respondent is barred.

XII Under the circumstances of the case, the Deputy Commissioner was wrong in treating the Appellant as a Regular Unit instead of treating the Respondent as a Regular Unit in which the question of Limitation would be required into and decided.

XIII That the order of the Deputy Commissioner is against Law and evidence and probabilities of the case.

Prayer

For the foregoing reasons, the Appellant prays that the order of the Deputy Commissioner may be set aside and that the Respondent may be directed to pay the Appellant the Respondent of the office of Patil of the village of

Kannada

ج-كراسة عدد ٢٧/٧٨٩٤

عطاء رقم ٢٧/٧٨٩٤

كراسة عطاء رقم ٢٧/٧٨٩٤

م - ٤٣ - ١٤٠٣

كراسة عطاء

مقاولات صحية

٤٣ - ٣ - ٢٧

تاريخ الإصدار ٥ / ١٠ / ٢٠٠٢

تاريخ الإغلاق ٢٠٠٢ - ١٠ - ٢٥

المشتري

4. ———— ———— ————

6. [illegible]

Venkatigowda
15-12-92
Bangalore

1/c

ನಂ

ಅನುಬಂಧ – ಸಿ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸೇವಕರ ನಡತೆ ನಿಯಮಗಳು

	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ			
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ
ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಇಂತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಹಿ

ಹುದ್ದೆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಇಇ 184 ಟಿಎಲ್ಎಂ 92 ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ 16-12-92

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಛೇರಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು	ಹುದ್ದೆ	ಕಛೇರಿಯ ವಿಳಾಸ	ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು	ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಹುದ್ದೆ	ಮೇಲ್ಮನವಿ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ವಿಳಾಸ	ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಡುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶ	ಷರಾ
1	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	
2	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	
3	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್	ಮುಖ್ಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು	

ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಐ.ಡಿ.ಎಲ್. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿ

Copy applied for 16-12-92
" ready for delivery 17-12-92
" delivered 17-12-92
No of words 205 " - 3 - 6
Rates Complaining " - 4 - 6
" - 7 - 0

ಸಹಿ/-

| | | |



E

1/2

ಗ ನಿಂತಿರುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ?

ಗ ನಿಂತಿರುವ ಮನುಷ್ಯನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ?

ಗ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವವರು ಯಾರು?

ಗ ಕುಳಿತಿರುವವರು ಯಾವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ

15/3/93

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

5

38

Appeal No. 142 of 1892-93

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Venkate Gowda of Belhally Gubbi Taluk represented by Mr. K. T. Narasimmiengar advocate.

R. R. 1892-4

Timmegowda represented by Mr. C. Krishnamurti advocate.

Decision.

Belhalli

Respondent's father Nanjegowda Gowda was the registered Patel of the village. In the Register of 1876, a remark is entered under the head of "Assistant Commissioner's recommendation", that the Registered was unfit and old, and his sons also unfit, Hireedas Venkate Gowda (appellant) was fit and can write". no appointment was formally made according to the recommendation, but somehow appellant got into office and was performing the duties from 1876.

In 1885 on the death of his father Respondent claimed the office and he was told that he was too young

Ale

the again claimed, (he being now about 26 years old) and the Dy. Commissioner gave him the appointment in January 1893. The appeal is against his appointment.

Appt

Seeing that the ~~Respondent~~ Appellant is a Minor and has been holding the office for the last 6 years, Govt are of opinion that he should not be removed from office - on his death or dismissal however Respondent may claim the office. The Dy. Comm. is requested to restore Appellant to office and let the Respondent wait for a vacancy.

By order

Chief Secretary

5/2/94

Reasp.

(Council order)

Ptn. 13486

No: 13486 / Pet. 7-91-93

8/12/94 / 13

Copy forwarded to the Dy. Comm. Tinnevelly District with reference to his letter No. 34 dated 10th July 1893. Vernacular words are returned.

Chief Secy.

praying that as he was competent to do the Pateli work, the office of Pateli of Bellahalli which was held by his father might be conferred upon him. The ryots of the village certified that the Petitioner was ~~the~~ the eldest son of the deceased Narasimha Gonda who had been the registered Patel of the village.

The Appellant Venkate Gonda deposed[x] before the Amildar as follows:—

"The registry of the Pateli of this village was in the name of Narasimha Gonda father of ~~the~~ Petitioner Giri Gonda. He was also looking after the work. In his life-time, in the time of Mr. Woodcock I made Firiyad that I was Hakdar and that the registry was in the name of my father's brother Narasimha Gonda. That officer was pleased to tell me that there was no need for Firiyad ~~was~~ and ~~necessary~~

[x] 9-12-92.

Assistant Comm.r

t he would give me the office and
t I was half-sharer. He also
d me to look after the work.
rom that time I have been
oing the work. I have no records
earing on the subject. Since
I am Kissadar, I do not like
to give the office to Giri Gonda
son of Narasimha Gonda. The
he order was given to me
about my appointment.

I have heard that my ancestors before 4 generations, and Giri Gonda's ancestors before 4 generations, were of [redacted] and the same family (Kudakattu) and were half sharers.

× × × ×

On 18th January 93 the Amildar submitted the following report to the Deputy Commr.—

× × × ×

In the Registers, the Petitioner's father's name alone is mentioned. In the register of 1875-76, Mr. Woodcock has stated that that Registerdar is old, and that his sons are not competent, and

above order.

The Appellant contends.—

(1) that the Appellant is a Hakdar to the office in question and the Respondent has no superior title to the same.

(2) that the Appellant was appointed to the office in question in his own right in 1875-76 and not either temporarily or conditionally.

(3) that he has been in possession of the office adversely to the Respondent for more than 12 years, and that the claim of the Respondent is barred.

(4) that the registers & Pattis produced with the appeal petition clearly shew that the Appellant is a Hakdar to the office.

(5) that the deputy Commrs order ~~was~~ is simply based on the Amildar's report.

(6) that he was given no notice of the enquiry, and he was given no opportunity to produce records, and

(7) that ~~the~~ the Deputy Comr the Appellant- erred in referring ~~the~~, instead of the Respondent, ~~the Appellant~~ to a regular Suit.

The Appellant has produced with his appeal petition ~~copies~~ extracts from the following, ~~suggestion~~, records:—

C. Patel Register of 1847.

Mudlagiri Gonda and Yalakki Gonda are mentioned to be the Hakdars as well as officiators.

D. Register of Village Servants for 1864. Yalakki Narasimha son of Yalakki Gonda is mentioned to be the office-holder, & the person actually doing work and Venkataramana Gonda and 5 others are mentioned in the column of "Kissedars or joint-Kissedars"

E. Register of Shanbhogs, Patels &c for 1864.—

"Bellahalli Village

Registerdars—

1 Mudlagiri Gonda - deceased
1 Yalakki Gonda do.

* *

Kissedars &c.

1 Venkataramana Gonda and Narasimha Gonda's son Narasimha

(5)

Miscellaneous of 1892-93

Appl
Venkatagowda
of Belleballi
Gubbi Taluq
Tumkur Dt
Represented by Mr K. S. Narasimhaiyengar, Advocate

Respt
Gowda —
Represented by Mr C. Krishnamurty, Advocate

Respt's father Narasimhagowda was the registered Patail of the village — In the Register of 1876, a remark is entered under the head "of assistant Comm's recommendation", that Registered was unfit, & so, & his sons also unfit, Narasadas. Venkatagowda (appl) was fit — the case wrote". — No appointment was formally made according to the recommendation but somehow appellant got into office & was performing the duties from 1876. Respt claimed the office & the Dy Comm's appointed him on July 1893. The appeal is against this order — that Respt is a stranger from the Register. On the death of the father In 1888 Respt claimed the Office

& he was told that he was too young. He again claimed, (he being now about 26 years old) & the Dy Comr gave him the appointment in January 1893. The appeal is against the appointment.

Seeing that the Respt is a Mohammedan & has been holding the office for the last 26 years, I am of opinion that he should not be removed from office — On his death, or dismissal however Respt may leave the office. The Dy Comr is requested to restore appt to office & tell Respt to wait for a vacancy.

24/1/94

Asst —
Pr reference to Dy Comr in whom order has been issued Vide

Pet. 1412

12-5-92

3

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2701 / AF 142

dated 19-4-93 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkatagowda of Bellalachi, Gubbi Taluk, appealing against the Deputy Commr of Tumkur, No 759920-1-3 regarding the Patakolike of the village

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, to the Deputy Commr of Tumkur District, for submission of Proofs with a report on the facts of the case and on the points taken in the petition.

2 The Petition with its enclosures to be returned.

R 158-92-2

By Order

Draft

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
7 May 1893

M. G. C. P. Bangalore.—21-11-92

No: 34. 16 Tumkur District

Deputy Commissioner's Office

Dated Tumkur 10th July 1893

(4)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Office
Memorandum No 1412 of the 6th May 189
forwarding for submission of
proceedings with a report the petition
of Venkatagowda of Bellahalli Villa
in the Gubbi Taluk, I have the hono
to state as follows.

2. The petitioner appeals against
the orders of this Office dispensing
with his services as Potail of the
said Bellahalli Village.

3. One Narasimha gowda was
the registered potail of the said
village. As he was too old to do the
duties of the office, and his sons

were minors, the appellant got into the office.

4. Recently Girigowda the eldest son of the said old registered Potail prayed for the restoration to him of his father's appointment as he had attained majority. The Shirdar reported that he was fit. Thereupon the office was restored to him and the appellant who alleged that he was also a Hukdar, told to establish his title, if any, in a regular suit. In the Potail Register of 1875-76 a remark has been made by Assistant Commissioner Mr. Woodcock to the effect that the appellant is a sharer. How and what ground it is not stated. He was therefore referred to a regular suit.

5. The Enclosures of the Docket under reply are herewith returned together with the record of the Case.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedient Servant
Sir
Deputy Commissioner

and he was doing the duties ~~and~~ of office since he was young and in consequence you were looking after the duties and that was by virtue of the Regulation we quoted that his letters of appointment should be given to him, an order was passed to the effect that it could not be done as he was young; that after he attained his majority, he again applied for the said appointment and that he is competent to look after the duties; it is ordered that his letters of appointment should be given to him. If you had referred to the duties of this office on your Handover, you could have traced the Handover Record of the time of occupancy. If you are a Valuer, you must obtain reports in a Regular Unit"

Ekc

on the 15-3-1893 on which date
he handed over charge of the office
in question to the Respondent as will
be found from the Rules regarding
Gazetting, herewith produced.

VIII. That the Appellant's endorsement
No 244 dated 3-4-1893 was passed
on the Review Petition preferred by the
Appellant after the Appellant knew
the Respondent's first Order
No 749 dated 20-1-1893 and in the
said Review Petition, the Appellant
has fully set forth his claims to
the office in question and also the
facts of the case;

IX. That though in his statement before
the Auditor, the Respondent is in his
own as 20, still, the Respondent is
not 20 years old, but he is aged 26 years

X. That the Appellant was appointed
to the office in question in his
own right in 1875-76 and not
either temporarily or conditionally.

XI. That, under any circumstances,
the Appellant has been in possession

village of Bellakalli which the
Assessment was 25 Rs per annum
from 1875-76.

4-93.

B

(1/2)

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾನ್ಯರು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನ
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವವರು —

ಈ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುವವರು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ
ಹೊಂಬಾಳಿ ಸೀಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಹೆಬ್ಬಳಿ ಅಂಚೆ ಆಫೀಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ
ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ——

1893 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಜೂನ್ ತಿಂಗಳು 18
ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ 949 ನೇ ನಂಬರಿನ ಆಜ್ಞಾಪತ್ರದಿಂದ
ಕೆಲವು ಪೋಸ್ಟಾಫೀಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಾಗಿ
ರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ——

ಆಫೀಸು ಮುಚ್ಚಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸದವರಿಗೆ
ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ
ವೆಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ
ಬರೆದ ಕಾಗದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ
ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಕಾಗದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ
ಹೀಗೆ ಬರೆದಿರುತ್ತದೆ ——

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಕಾಗದ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 47 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯ ಫೆ
ಬ್ರವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೆಲವು ಪೋಸ್ಟಾಫೀಸು
ಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಚ್ಚಿಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಪೋಸ್ಟಾಫೀಸು
ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸದವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು
ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರೇ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ
ವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬರೆದಿರುತ್ತದೆ ——

ವಿವರಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಪಾಲನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ಹೂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಪಾಲನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ಹೂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

2. ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕೋರಿರುವ ಪರಿಹಾರವೆಂದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಪಾಲನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಪಾಲಿನ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಶಾಶ್ವತ ತಡೆಯಾಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಪಾಲಿನ ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನವನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಶಾಶ್ವತ ತಡೆಯಾಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

3. ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಪ್ರಕ್ರಿಯಾ ಸಂಹಿತೆಯ ಆದೇಶ 37 ನಿಯಮ 3 ರಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ನಂತರ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಈ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯ ಸಮನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

7. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

8. [illegible]

[illegible]

9. [illegible]

No 2701-

13-2-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

January 189 7

Endorsement granted to Venkata Gowda of Selh Gubbi Taluk,

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2701 dated 19 April regarding his claim to the Patelship of Rel

---

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the Dy. Comm to whom orders have been issued

L.R. 158-92-5

Cl 57/94

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

merit order)
SHR

Redraft

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

ಕ್ರ. ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ಪ್ರ. ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಹೆಸರು	ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ	ಸಂಪಾದಕರ ಹೆಸರು	ಪ್ರಕಾಶಕರ ಹೆಸರು	ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಸ್ಥಳ	ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಅವಧಿ	ಪ್ರಸಾರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಭಾಷೆ
1	ದೈನಿಕ	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ	ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ	ದೈನಿಕ	7,000	ಕನ್ನಡ
2	ವಾರಪತ್ರಿಕೆ	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ	ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ	ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿ	ವಾರಪತ್ರಿಕೆ	2,000	ಕನ್ನಡ

ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಸ್ವಾಮ್ಯ ಕುರಿತ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ ಕೊಡಿ.

ನಾನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಘೋಷಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ವಿವರಗಳು ನನ್ನ ಅರಿವು ಮತ್ತು ನಂಬಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸತ್ಯವಾಗಿವೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ 6.7.2018 ಸಹಿ/-

ಪ್ರಕಾಶಕರ ಸಹಿ

ಪ್ರಕಾಶಕರ ಹೆಸರು





	28	29	30



Copy applied for 16-12-92
Do ready for delivery 17-12-92
Do delivered on 17-12-92
Do officer Rs. ~~300~~ 275
Copy fee ~~Rs. 6~~ annas three, and paise six
Copying fee Rs. ~~6~~ Nil
Ruling — 4 —
4-7-6.

| | | |